

U. H. J. impartial Person to judge such a Continuance expedient, and even then the Upper House was prevail'd on by your Offer of 6<sup>d</sup>  $\text{p}$  hogs-head instead of 3<sup>d</sup> to wave that Continuance, and concur with your House in a Bill for Six Pence  $\text{p}$  hhd for three years, and supposing for Arguments sake that a Continuance to the End of the next Session

p. 97 was really improper, will it from thence follow that you have a Right to insist on having this very Continuance which you object to in a Bill for the defence of the Province put to every other Law you think fit on the Contrary, has not the Upper House an indisputable Right to leave it out, or put it into every Bill they pass, as they think proper. But to Obviate this glaring Truth, you very roundly assert " that it is " well known that that Country Laws before mentioned never yet had " any other kind of Duration than for a certain Time, and to the End " of the next Session of Assembly " pray Gentlemen are you really so Ignorant of this Affair yourselves as to think this, or do you think you may say any thing to me upon this Argument, pray look in the printed Body of Laws Folio 220 and you will find the Act for relieving the Inhabitants of this Province, from some Aggrievances in the Prosecutions of Suits at Law, only revived and continued from the then Session to the 29 of September 1723

Having now shewn clearly your Mistake in advancing that the Province was kept out of an Assembly for almost three years, for want of Your Houses Compliance with the unlimited Continuance (as you call it) of the Bill for 3<sup>d</sup>  $\text{p}$  hhd, to the end of the next Session of Assembly, which Dispute did not arise till this present year 1740. I shall further shew that your Endeavours to drop that Bill did not at all Arise from the Upper House insisting on the Continuance you mention but that on the Contrary, the Upper House insisting on that Continuance, did in Reality proceed from the Resolution you declared of dropping that Bill for very different Reasons from what you now give, and that I may not do you any [Injury] I shall shew your said Resolution and the Reasons of it in your own Message of the 9<sup>th</sup> of June 1739 previous to any dispute about the Continuance of the Bill for Arms &c<sup>a</sup> you say " The uncertainty whether Peace or War in Europe having subsisted for some time, and there now being the Sums of £2250..11..2 Sterling and £34..13..7 $\frac{3}{4}$  Current Gold in Bank arising from that Duty besides upwards of £2500 Sterling unaccounted for in any manner, We have as We think justly concluded that his Excellency and Your Honours have been of opinion that either Arms and Ammunition were useless to the Province, or that there is a sufficient Stock already Provided, otherwise you would never have neglected so essential a part of Your Duty, as is the Care and laying out that Duty had you thought it necessary for the Safety of the People Wherefore, until that money is accounted for and that in Bank laid out &c<sup>a</sup> We do not think the Revival of that Bill necessary "